

REMARKS**I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-12 and 19-25 are currently pending in the application.

By this Amendment, new claims 31 and 32 have been added. No new matter has been added by this Amendment.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-12, 19-25, 31 and 32 remain pending.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-12 and 19-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Dedrick (US Patent No. 5,768,521). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims as follows.

Since the Advisory Action and prior Office Actions do not adequately address Applicant's remarks in the after final reply, these remarks particularly as to independent claims 1 and 19 are respectfully resubmitted for consideration.

1. CLAIM 1:

Claim 1 is directed to an arrangement involving selecting a sequence of components for processing data, each component having an input format and an output format such that the output format of a component is compatible with the input format of the next component in the sequence; invoking each of the components in sequence wherein output data of a component is input data for the next component in the sequence; and recording an amount of data processed by each component.

On the contrary, in Dedrick, an end user of a client computer can request consumption of information and a metering mechanism determines whether the end user can

consume the requested information. See Dedrick, Abstract. If the end user can access the requested information, the metering mechanism transfers the information to the end user and may charge a price of the information to an electronic account of the end user stored in a database of the metering server. See Dedrick, Abstract and col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 25. A transaction database 32 (used for billing) stores, among other things, the end user's account and a log of a transaction including the price of the transaction and the type of information consumed. See Dedrick, col. 3, lines 36-40 and col. 4, lines 14-17. There is however nothing in Dedrick (including the transaction database 32) as relied upon by the Examiner that suggests or discloses any recording of an amount of data processed by each component. Dedrick simply stores information pertaining to the content transferred (as noted above), but is silent as to any recording of an amount of usage (e.g., data processing) of each component. Thus, Dedrick does not disclose or suggest any recording an amount of data processing by each component. This is further supported by the fact that there is at the least no explicit disclosure of any such component in Dedrick, as acknowledged by the Examiner's inherency allegations. See Office Action, page 3.

Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Dedrick and are patentably distinguishable over the same.

2. CLAIM 19:

Claim 19 is directed to an arrangement involving identifying a sequence of components for processing the transferred data, wherein each component in the sequence has an input format and an output format such that the output format of a component is compatible with the input format of the next component in the sequence; and invoking each of the components in

sequence wherein one component uniquely identifies the source of the data and wherein the amount of data associated with the identified source is logged.

On the contrary, Dedrick is silent as to one component uniquely identifying the source of data, as claimed. As acknowledged by the Examiner, there is no explicit disclosure of any such component in Dedrick. The Examiner asserts that conversion components are inherent in Dedrick. See Office Action, page 3. However, the Examiner still has not provided any objective basis identifying where or how Dedrick suggests or discloses that a component, such as the alleged conversion components, uniquely identifies the source of data. Indeed, the Office Action does not address this claim language with reasonable particularity or even at all, specifically as it pertains to a “component” that uniquely identifies the source of data. It necessarily follows that Dedrick also does not disclose or suggest that the amount of data associated with the identified source is logged.

Accordingly, claim 19 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Dedrick and are patentably distinguishable over the same.

3. NEW CLAIMS 30 AND 31:

Dependent claims 30 and 31 further recite receiving streaming data to be processed, wherein the data processed by the sequence of components comprises the received streaming data.

Dedrick is believed to be also silent as to the operations of the respective base claims 1 (e.g., selecting, invoking and recording) and 19 (e.g., identifying and invoking) as to the processing of received streaming data. Thus, claims 30 and 31 are believed to be further distinguishable over the cited reference.

CONCLUSION


Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

Applicant believes that no additional fees are necessary for the submission of this Amendment and Response, however, should any fees be due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such fees which may be required for this Amendment and Response, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 3802-4055US1. A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: 2/7/06

By: 
James Hwa
Registration No. 42,680

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 (telephone)
(212) 415-8701 (facsimile)